UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,759	06/13/2006	Salomon Leendert Abrahamse	F7748(V)	6624

201 7590 03/29/2011

UNILEVER PATENT GROUP
800 SYLVAN AVENUE
AG West S. Wing
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100

EXAMINER	
HEARD, THOMAS SWEENEY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1654	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/29/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentgroupus@unilever.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/582,759	ABRAHAMSE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANDREW D. KOSAR	1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 December 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-4 and 9* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)	
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/14/07*.	6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group II in the reply filed on December 22, 2010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-4 and 9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 22, 2010.

Sequence Compliance

Applicant is advised that the application is not in compliance with 37 CFR §§ 1.821-1.825.

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR § 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR §§ 1.821-1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Applicant must comply with the requirements of the sequence rules (37 CFR §§ 1.821- 1.825) in order to effect a complete response to this office action.

Specifically, the specification includes sequences embraced by the sequence rules, such as IIAEK, KVLPVP and HLPLP (e.g. page 14, lines 12-13 and Table 2). Additionally, Applicant has not provided a CRF, paper copy or the required statements directing entry of the sequence listing.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 5 recites P and A (Pro and Ala), which are not found in the specification, and thus lack antecedent basis to the specification.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: As set forth above, the specification fails to comply with the sequence rules, having sequences without sequence identifiers. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp., 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The claims are drawn to the peptide XPP, conventionally accepted as a tripeptide, however claims 7 and 8 appear to indicate that XPP is broader than the commonly accepted use of peptide descriptions. Claims 7 and 8 state "wherein the XPP is XPP, wherein X =...". The statement indicates that XPP in claim 5 is not simply a discrete tripeptide, as would be accepted

by the artisan. The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term and it is unclear whether XPP refers only to a tripeptide, or something else.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANG (US Patent 4,585,757) in view of MISHIMA (JP 3068656 B2; Derwent Abstract) and KUDO (JP 05339166 A; Derwent Abstract).

The instant claims are drawn to a food product suitable for lowering blood pressure comprising the tripeptide XPP, where X is C, M, S, T, K, P or A at 5mg/g or more.

Pang teaches the antihypertensive tripeptide KPP in an antihypertensive composition and a method of treating hypertension (e.g. claims 1 and 4). Pang does not teach the peptide in a food at the recited quantity.

Mishima and Kudo teaches antihypertensive peptides in food compositions.

The Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper "functional approach" to the determination of obviousness as laid down in Graham. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.

Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include:

(A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;
(B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;
(C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;
(D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;
(E) "Obvious to try" – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;
(F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;
(G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

Note that the list of rationales provided is not intended to be an all-inclusive list. Other rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness may be relied upon by Office personnel.

Here, at least rationale (B) applies, in that it is nothing more than simple substitution to replace the antihypertensive peptide of Mishima or Kudo with the tripeptide KPP of Pang to obtain the predictable result of making a food product having an antihypertensive peptide.

With regards to the quantity of peptide present, Pang, Mishima and Kudo all teach that the composition is used for treating hypertension, and one of skill in the art would be aware to vary the amount present, such that an antihypertensive effect is achieved. As such, it would be nothing more than routine optimization to determine the quantity of antihypertensive peptide needed to achieve the desired effect.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (In re Opprecht 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); In re Bode 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANG (US Patent 4,585,757) in view of MISHIMA (JP 3068656 B2; Derwent Abstract) and KUDO (JP 05339166 A; Derwent Abstract), as applied to claims 5 and 6 above, and in further view of DORER (abstract; IDS 11/14/07), OH (abstract; IDS 11/14/07), FUMIO (IDS 11/14/07), TAKANO (IDS 11/14/07), TJOENG (IDS 11/14/07), CANN (J.R. Cann et al. Biochem. (1976) 15(3), pages 498-504) or MOSKAL (WO 97/43306 A1).

The teachings of Pang, Mishima and Kudo are presented above. Pang does not teach CPP, MPP, SPP or TPP.

Dorer teaches RPP as an ACE inhibitor, Oh teaches GPP as an ACE inhibitor, Fumio teaches LPP as an ACE inhibtor, including forms such as a food product, Takano teaches VPP and IPP as ACE inhibitors (throughout), Tjoeng teaches HPP as an antihypertensive in food (e.g. claim 6). Cann teaches the peptide SPP (e.g. Table 1) and Moskal teaches the tripeptide TPP as a neuropeptide (NT-14, e.g. page 5).

Here, at least rationale (G) (above) would apply, as it would have been evident to the artisan that the peptides having the XPP tripeptide motif are antihypertensives, such as LPP, IPP, VPP, HPP, KPP and RPP. Thus, one would reasonably conclude that any peptide having the XPP motif would function as an antihypertensive. One would have been motivated to have used any XPP peptide in making an antihypertensive food substance, include the tripeptide SPP of Cann or TPP of Moskal with the reasonable expectation that it would function as an antihypertensive, based on the art of record showing that peptides having the XPP motif function as antihypertensives. Obviousness does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success, i.e., a reasonable expectation of obtaining similar properties. See, e.g., In re O*'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894, 903, 7 USPQ2d 1673, 1681 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (In re Opprecht 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); In re Bode 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976). In light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a). From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole

was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to ANDREW D. KOSAR at telephone number (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am -5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on (571)272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew D Kosar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654